



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. XXXV.

"WELL, Pat, how did you get through since?" said Jem.  
 "Well, I put in the sorest time that ever came on a wife and childer," said Pat. "I stood at the cross, and I offered to work under wages, and not a man would look at me; for Father John read me out at the chapel, and when work was scarce, and the boys all looking for it, nobody would have any call to me."

"And wouldn't any of the Protestants give you work itself?" said Jem.

"Well, the Protestants is mighty shy of them that turns," said Pat. "They're afraid of trouble, and they don't like to come under Father John's tongue no more nor ourselves. And, besides, the people was riz about the election, and all the blackguards was up, and them paid for mischief, and the railway paid to fetch them on Sundays and week days into Kilscommon from Newtown, the way them that did the beating would not be known, and no one durst go again Father John and his boys while that lasted; and it's myself that got it too, when Father Peter gave the wink on me, and them boys followed me out of the town, and fell to jostling and kicking me."

"And did they hurt you, man?" said Jem.

So Pat put one hand on his chin, and the other to his upper lip, and he pulled his own mouth open, and then tried to say, "Will you look where my teeth wor, Jem." So Jem looked, and three of Pat's front teeth were gone.

"Oh, man alive, did the villains do that on you?" said Jem.

"Why wouldn't they?" said Pat. "When Father John took the praties off me, why wouldn't they take the teeth? What call would I have to teeth?"

"Isn't it the wonder the government doesn't make a law to let people do as they like and vote as they like, without sticks and stones on them?" said Jem.

"Well, Jem, isn't there law for that already, only the polis can't be on every road to see fair play. Sure the law is good enough, if the priests would only tell the boys to mind it; but it's neither law nor gospel with them. Well, I seen one man anyway, and he did it rightly."

"And what was that, Pat," said Jem.

"I don't know his name," said Pat; "but he was a snug farmer, and him a Roman, coming in to vote again the priest. And I seen him put his horse in a stable, and his cart on the street; and he stuck the whip in under the hay, and him just starting down the street to vote. Well, some decent people advised him for to not go down the street, for the boys was killing every one with the sticks. Well, he just turns and looks down the street, and sure enough he seen them at it. Well, the never a word he says, but just takes the whip out from under the hay, and the fine new thong it had on it, and away he walks down the street, and him looking that quiet and that bould. Well, I just followed him down a bit, and afore he got fifty yards there was twenty made a run at him with the sticks. Well, he just drew a crack of the cart-whip you would hear a quarter of a mile off, and you never seen a flock of sheep run purtier nor they ran before him. Well, I seen Father Peter come into the middle of them, and says he, 'For shame, boys; is it cowards you are?' Go back to him this minute; and back they went, and the next crack just sent them flying again; and he marched down the street, cracking his whip every foot, and looking at no one, and not one meddled him. Well, that was the time Father Peter gave them the wink on me, and I knowed I was set, and sure enough I was."

"And couldn't you swear it on them?" said Jem.

"And how would I know the Newtown boys to swear it on?" said Pat. "Sure that's the way it's done, by strange boys. And wasn't I alone, and wouldn't there be twenty to swear I done it myself? But I wouldn't care for that, once the election is done," said Pat; "sure it's the praties and the work that I care for."

"And how did you come through at all?" said Jem.

"The way we come through the famine—starving and crying," said Pat. "I never knew worse in the famine; and it's harder nor all when man does it on you, and not God."

"And wouldn't you speak to Mr. Owens, maybe?" said Jem.

"Well, I wouldn't, for I didn't turn for meal, and I wouldn't have that put on me," said Pat; "and Mr. Owens thinks little of them that would turn for meal, or he could have plenty of them, as I know well, so I didn't go near him."

"And how did you get through at all?"

"Well, I put down the old coat I got after harvest and Biddy's petticoat, and on that we got some turnips, and when that was done, the childer cried themselves to sleep; but when the darlings got up next day, and never got bit nor sup, and the wife crying in the corner, I thought I was gone wild entirely. And the good wife she is, that never said one word to fault what I done, nor let me see her crying while she could hide it. Well, that was the sore day, and it was coming on the sore night; and I was thinking would I take the childer to the workhouse, if they got through the night; but wouldn't that be the sore place on them and me, after what I done? Sure, them that turns has no business in the workhouse. And where would I ever get another cabin to put them in, if I got out again? Well, while I was turning it over, what would come into the house only a bag with a half-hundred of meal, and a new blanket, and five shillings, that Mr. Owens sent down when he heard the way we were. Well, if the darlings hadn't their supper that night, it was quare. Well, I went

down to Mr. Owens next day to thank him for the childer's lives, and he allowed it wasn't he done it at all. 'It surely was, your reverence,' says I. And with that he said it was money that was given to him by reason of the Rights of Conscience Society,\* and that if I didn't get work to earn for the childer's bread, he would get the Rights of Conscience Society to come to the place themselves, and set up work for them that was put out of it. 'And what's the Conscience Society your reverence?' says I. And so he told me it was a society in Dublin and in England that allowed every man had rights of conscience to worship God and read his book, and that would help every man to that same when it was took off him. And he allowed it was the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin and the Protestants that done that same. 'I mind that now,' says I. 'Sure I seen a man out of England that told me he went into a meeting, and heard the Archbishop making them a speech, telling them to keep up the rights of conscience; but it's little I thought then it was to send the supper into my poor darlings' mouths, and them at the last shift.'

"Well, if that don't come nearer to feeding the birds nor anything ever I heard," said Jem. "If the quality would only mind that advice, and stand up for the rights of conscience for every man to do what he knows is right, that would be the thing to put heart in poor men like us to do what's right. It will be the great day for Ireland when the rights of conscience is free. But how did you come on, Pat, when that meal was out?"

"Well," said Pat, "that got me through till the weather took up for the praty-planting. So I takes my spade, and stands at the cross. Well, who would come by but Father Peter, and says he, 'Boys, aren't you Catholics, and is it standing with a turncoat heretic you are?' says he. 'What business has turncoat heretics about the cross?' says he. 'Will I be ashamed of you for boys that won't stand up for your religion?' says he. With that I spoke up to him: 'It's the Queen's street I'm on,' says I, 'and I ax leave of no man to stand on it. I'm come here to earn the childer's bread with my own hands, and nobody else's,' says I. 'You'll have to leave this,' says he. 'Boys,' says he, 'will you stand it to have the likes among you?' Well, with that Mr. Nulty steps in, hiring men. 'He won't leave it till I hire him,' Father Peter, says Nulty. 'Is it hiring turncoat heretics you are?' says Father Peter. 'That won't hurt his digging,' says Mr. Nulty. 'Sure he's the best spade in the parish, and I'll hire him afore anyone. Boys, wages is high, and I don't grudge top price, and over too; but the man that gives work for the wages is the man for me,' says Mr. Nulty. Well, Father Peter got quite mad, and says he, 'If you hire that turncoat you'll not get another man in the street to go with you, and with that he kept looking at the boys as if he was cursing every mother's son of them in his heart, 'cause he knew well there wasn't a man there that wouldn't sooner go to Mr. Nulty nor to any one else. 'Won't I?' says Mr. Nulty. 'Isn't it a free country, and can't every man do as he likes with his own hands and his own money; but it isn't free all as one as the slave states in America, where no man thinks he's free but when he is walloping a nigger. We want no slave-drivers here to make us free of their horsewhips, nor no niggers to work for walloping or horsewhipping! I give free wages, and I'll get free men,' says Mr. Nulty; and then he turns to the boys, and says he, 'I meddle with no man's religion, and I have no call to them that does; let every man take his own way for that, and give another the liberty he likes himself: wages for work and work for wages is the bargain here.' Well, he said that out like a man. You know, Jem, the way Mr. Nulty lays a thing down, as if it was better nor done once he says it. So Father Peter seen he was beat, and off he went, choking with rage, and Mr. Nulty just took the pick of the boys; and now, Jem, I would get work at the cross just the same as another, and Father Peter himself won't dare to say again it."

"Well, there's nothing beats a priest like standing up to him, because they're not used to it," said Jem; "and they are so feared too, because once the boys sees they can be beat, why they are down entirely."

"Jem, it's the work that will make Ireland free," said Pat. "Sure, when labourers is scarce, a man will betook for his spade, and not to please the priest. And I know what I'll do now: I'll handle myself at the spade; for sure when a man gets good wages he may give good work, and never fear but he'll get the wages now, when he gives the value; for them that has to give high wages will be thankful for willing hands and hearts to work. So, with God's blessing, I will get through yet."

We trust what the Irish people have already suffered, and what they yet may learn, may be made instrumental in making Ireland free. There is no liberty like that which Christ has promised: "If ye continue in my word, ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

And we believe that the present state of the labour market, and the rising rate of wages, will do more than any law could do towards securing to the people of Ireland the power of being free. But wages can be raised and maintained at their proper level only by labourers being resolved to give good value for good wages, as Pat intends to do.

At the same time, there is much yet to be done to secure

\* We must admit that Mr. Owens here, no doubt from the pressing nature of poor Pat's case, rather exceeded his authority. To prevent misconception, we think it right to subjoin a brief statement of the rules of the Rights of Conscience Society, which we strongly recommend to the attention of all our readers.

"the rights of conscience" for poor Irishmen; and we hope that Pat's experience may stir up many to support that admirable society, which comes before the public in a manner which justifies it to their confidence and support.

The Society for protecting the Rights of Conscience was instituted in 1850, under the patronage of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, for the purpose of protecting, in the exercise of their Christian liberty, those converts who have been deprived of all former means of earning a livelihood on account of their change of religion.

It is no part of the object of this society to interfere, in any way, with the teaching and converting of the people; nor can it restore the social or friendly ties which may have been sacrificed to the free exercise of conscience, by those who have been taught to exchange error for truth; but when their sincerity has been sufficiently tested by this most painful ordeal, aggravated by the want of those necessities of life formerly obtained by daily labour, it appears to be a clear Christian duty to reach forth a helping hand to preserve such objects of bigotry from perishing through exclusive dealing or want of employment. For this purpose, the society makes grants to trustworthy individuals in each locality to enable them to provide employment; with the distinct understanding, that no money shall be given except as wages for work actually done, or for the tools and reproductive materials required for it; and that a full account shall be furnished, stating names and dates for all payments.

The committee have had the satisfaction of learning that, at least in one locality, the mere knowledge of the existence of this society has effectually hindered persecution.

## Correspondence.

## THE SEARCH AFTER INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Being one of those who think that the controversy between Protestants and Catholics hinges mainly on the question of the infallibility of the Church, I have taken as much pains as my opportunities would permit to make myself acquainted with what has been said on this subject on both sides. With this view, I have carefully perused your pages; and I was particularly struck with the argument put forward by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, in a sermon entitled "Search after Infallibility," which you inserted in, I think, your first volume. I was so staggered by Dr. Whately's argument, that I consulted a Catholic friend, who is deeply read in controversial theology, and asked him how this argument, which seemed to me unanswerable, could be met. After some deliberation, and looking over books, he handed to me a volume of essays by the Rev. Dr. Murray, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Maynooth, and told me that I should find in it a complete refutation of what he called Dr. Whately's sophistry. I read the essay carefully, and, so far as I can judge, Dr. Murray has, as my friend said, completely answered Dr. Whately. Still, I am anxious to know whether you can say anything against the soundness of Dr. Murray's argument, as I don't quite trust my own judgment when two skilful logicians are defending opposite sides of a question. At present I am entirely convinced by the Maynooth professor. But I send you an abstract (as carefully made as I could) of his reply to the Protestant Archbishop, in hopes that you will favour me with your opinion thereon.

Dr. Murray denies Dr. Whately's inference, that if our Blessed Lord had instituted an infallible authority on earth for defining articles of faith and settling controversies, St. Paul (to whom such an institution must have been known) would certainly have referred to it as a means, or rather, the means of meeting the dangers against which he warns the Ephesian elders; and that he would not have confined himself to exhorting them to "watch and remember," &c. (Acts xx, 31), as if these were the only means of safety. St. Paul, Dr. Murray argues, had, as the context shows, himself taught every one of them the whole counsel of God. Consequently, they had no need to recur to an infallible tribunal, either to learn for the first time what they had not known before, or to learn more fully and distinctly what they had previously received but partially and imperfectly. Their knowledge was complete. They needed no further teaching from any tribunal, fallible or infallible. The danger threatened was from open heretics and schismatics, endeavouring to corrupt the faith—"speaking perverse things"—and to break the unity of the church—"to draw away disciples after them." To meet and defeat such adversaries there was no use in flying to an infallible church, infallible council, or infallible see. They had learned the true doctrine already from an infallible Apostle. No authority on earth—Pope, Council, or Universal Church—could teach more truly, or interpret more clearly. They possessed the treasure of sound doctrine. Their duty was simply to preserve it. And the mode which St. Paul indicated was the only one whereby this could be effected, viz.: "Take heed to yourselves" . . . "Watch" . . . "Remember." Appeal to another infallible authority would have been useless. The function of infallible authority, as such, is to preserve, define, propose, teach, sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous teaching. The Ephesian Elders already possessed the

whole of the sound doctrine in its purity. The danger to which they were to be exposed was that of falling away from the truth. This danger was to be avoided by watching and prayer and pastoral supervision, and by them alone. Dr. Murray goes still further, and concludes that a reference to an infallible tribunal in this case would have been not only unnecessary but positively mischievous; inasmuch as it would contradict St. Paul's own assertion that he had himself faithfully and fully instructed them in the truth. Lastly, Dr. Murray *reverts* the Protestant Archbishop's argument. There was, he observes, an infallible authority—that of St. Paul and the other inspired Apostles—actually living, speaking, teaching, defining, explaining, at the very time when the dangers spoken of were likely to occur and did occur. But St. Paul did not refer to this infallible authority as a means of providing against the dangers. Therefore, he *did not think it necessary* to refer to an infallible authority.

Such, sir, is Dr. Murray's conclusive (as it seems to me) refutation of Dr. Whately's much talked of, and, I admit, very ingenious, argument against infallibility. I trust you will redeem the pledge you have so often given of opening your pages to all fair discussion, and point out, if you can, any flaw in Dr. Murray's reasoning.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,  
AN INQUIRER.

We gladly insert the foregoing letter, and did not need a reference to the pledge we have so often given to induce us to do so. We should be ashamed of having assumed the position we hold, if there were any one who could justly charge us with having evaded any fair discussion which came within the legitimate limits of the objects of our journal; and we think none more legitimately falls within them than the question of the asserted infallibility of the Church, on which we think, with our correspondent, that the controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics mainly hinges. Once prove that asserted infallibility, and all the rest of her teachings follows of course. Once reject it, and all the rest of her doctrines fall with it, save so far as they, or any of them, may be capable of independent proof, distinct from the mere authority of the Church of Rome asserting them.

Our correspondent says Dr. Murray's answer to Archbishop Whately's celebrated argument appears to him to be conclusive, and asks us to point out, if we can, any flaw in Dr. M.'s reasonings.

We think we have already done so in No. 9 of our journal; and although our answer to Dr. Murray's essay was published so far back as the month of September, 1852, and the Rev. Dr. Murray's attention was specially called to it (through the medium of his publisher, Gerald Bellw, 79, Grafton-street, Dublin, to whom we applied for permission to reprint Dr. Murray's essay *verbatim* before we replied to it), we are not aware that Dr. Murray has ever attempted to reply to our answer, though we know our readers—Roman Catholics as well as Protestant—ardently desired that he should have done so.

As, however, others beside our present correspondent may require to have their memories refreshed upon the subject, we gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity briefly to recapitulate the flaws in Dr. Murray's argument which we then pointed out, and which we believe proved that it was no refutation of Archbishop Whately's reasoning, but, on the contrary, one of the most explicit abandonments of the asserted necessity for an infallible Church to be found in the writings of any Roman Catholic divine. We cannot, within the limited space at our command, repeat in full, or, perhaps, make sufficiently clear, all that (we humbly conceive) we demonstrated in our article of September, 1852; but if our correspondent, or any other of our readers interested in the subject, will take the trouble of referring to our 1st vol., pp. 102-104, we think they will admit that what we then said deserved attention, even from the Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology in the Royal College of Maynooth.

We showed, among other things, that it is an error to suppose that St. Paul was *exclusively* addressing the elders at Miletus, who had enjoyed the benefit of his own infallible teaching, or that he was merely cautioning them against a specific danger which was to occur immediately, or shortly after his departure, without reference to their successors as well as themselves. We think we proved that both St. Paul, who spoke, and St. Luke, who recorded his exhortation, considered that, in addressing these elders on their duty after his removal, he was laying down maxims to regulate both them and their successors. It was the duty of "the ancients of the Church" not only to teach the laity, but to continue their own order; and as he was now leaving his last legacy of warning to a permanent body of teachers, for their direction, under very dangerous circumstances, and in a time of persecution, when some changes in the members of that body might speedily be looked for, it would be strange if his mind had not viewed them under this aspect, and addressed in them their successors also, who would not have the same advantages of *personal* teaching from inspired Apostles; and, therefore, *very strange* if, speaking under such circumstances to such a body, he should say nothing of the infallible guide, supposing such to exist.

We also showed that Dr. Murray's own definition, that

"the function of infallible authority, as such, is to preserve, define, propose, teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrine," cited by our correspondent, contains within itself the refutation of his whole argument. For if one of the functions of an infallible authority, as such, be to preserve sound doctrine, recourse to that infallible authority would be at least a *part* (and if so, surely a most important part) of the means of overcoming the danger of falling away from the truth and losing the grace of faith, which it was his object to guard them against. To be consistent with Dr. Murray's argument, his sentence should have run thus:—"The function of infallible authority, as such, is *not* to preserve, but to define, propose, teach, &c." Is it not, therefore, we ask, plain that Dr. Murray is obliged either to exclude "preserving sound doctrine" from the functions of an infallible Church, as he virtually does in this argument, or to admit that his reply to Archbishop Whately is inconclusive and illogical? We called on, and still call on: Dr. Murray to answer this plain question—does the function of an infallible authority, as such, include or exclude the preserving sound doctrine? And upon what authority does he so define it either one way or the other? Moreover, by Dr. Murray's definition, it also is part of the functions of infallible authority to "proscribe erroneous doctrine;" and if that be so, would not such an infallible tribunal, authorised to teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrines, have been obviously the most effectual, if it be not the *only* effectual preservative (as Roman Catholics usually conceive it to be), against "falling away from the truth," and therefore such a means of preserving truth as St. Paul could not have been silent about when warning the Ephesians against the perils he described? Whence were those perils to come? Not, be it remembered, from open or undisguised heretics, as gratuitously assumed by Dr. Murray, but from *disguised* and *unsuspected* heretics—"wolves in sheep's clothing," "false apostles and deceitful workers, who would transform themselves into apostles of Christ," even as "Satan transformed himself into an angel of light," and who were to arise from their own body ("of your own selves"), and speak perverse things. It was against these that he exhorted them to "watch," and what means could have been so proper to detect these *disguised* heretics as that same infallible tribunal, whose function it is to proscribe erroneous doctrine, and expose and punish heresy? And yet St. Paul is wholly silent concerning it.

With every word that Dr. Murray has said about "watching and praying, and pastoral supervision," we cordially agree, and have no doubt that Archbishop Whately, and all sound Protestant divines, would do so too; but it is, certainly, a new and bold thing for a Roman Catholic divine to assert that watchfulness and prayer are the means, and the sole means, of "preserving the treasure of sound doctrine when once possessed." If this be so, an infallible authority is unnecessary for the transmission of divine truth, and, therefore, no longer requisite, even as a means for the prevention of disputes and detection of heresy—a conclusion at variance with all other Roman Catholic teachings, and which we can never believe will be adopted by that Church, whose chief boast and pride it is that by its infallibility, and that alone, unity can be secured and heresies prevented. The Irish Roman Catholic Church may, indeed, be induced to wink at Dr. Murray's argument, as a convenient mode of reply to a difficult Protestant objection; but we cannot think the Roman Catholic laity (including, we presume, our respected correspondent) will consider that they derive much benefit in following the teaching of an infallible guide, if they should be once convinced by Dr. Murray that they must, after all, still rely exclusively on watchfulness and prayer as the sole means of continuing in the true faith, just as if they were Protestants, and had no such infallible guide to trust to as a preservative against error.

We shall be exceedingly glad to hear again from our intelligent correspondent, especially if he will previously read and consider the whole argument as given in our September number, 1852, a copy of which he can readily procure at the publishers. We can assure him, we are sincerely anxious to discover if there really be any infallible guide on earth, and ready and willing to follow it, if we could only be shown sufficient proof that it exists, and where to find it. He may, therefore, feel secure of our honest and hearty co-operation in his "Search after Infallibility." Let us both in the meantime earnestly watch and pray, that we may be led by the Holy Spirit in such search, and not allowed to fall into the fatal delusion of mistaking the teaching of fallible man for that of the infallible guide for which we are searching.

#### THE REDEMPTORISTS' CATECHISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Allow me to call your attention to a little book called, *The Short Catechism*, or "What every Christian must know," which seems to accompany the Redemptorist Fathers wherever they wander through our land. It is from the pen of the "Rev. J. Furniss, priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer." For whose use it is intended is avowed in the following extract, from a notice in its first page:—"The Short Catechism, or What every Christian must know," containing exactly what the Church commands everyone to know, might be useful for children, who have not yet learned these

things; also for grown-up persons, who go to confession without that knowledge which is necessary for the sacraments; also for lay persons, to instruct the ignorant." That this book is of authority, will not be questioned by those in communion with the See of Rome, when on its last page they read—"Imprimatur PAULUS CULLEN, ARCHIEPISCOPUS DUBLINENSIS."

This book ought to interest every Irishman; for it is used to instruct the ignorant of our native land, whether children or grown-up persons. What, if the ignorant are found teaching the ignorant! the blind the blind! What, if the instruction in this catechism be much of it essential error, directly opposed to the teaching of the Holy Spirit contained in Holy Scripture. Permit me to remark on a little of much that is most objectionable in so small a book.

Every Christian, by the command of the Church, must know at least—1. The four great truths of Faith. 2. The Sacraments; at least baptism, confession, and the blessed sacrament. 3. The commandments of God and the Church. 4. The prayers; Our Father, Hail Mary, and the Creed, or I Believe.—See St. Alphonsus Liguori.—page 3.

The moral character of the Redemptorist teaching, approved by Dr. Cullen, may be ascertained by comparing the four great truths of Faith, p. 3, with what purports to be a repetition of them in p. 29. That we may see whether they are in these pages the same, in substance at least, if not in words, let us put them in contrast, as set forth in each of these pages:—

|                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| P. 3.—1. "One God."                                                                               | P. 29.—1. "I believe that you are one God in three persons; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."            |
| 2. "Three persons; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."                                      | 2. "I believe that God the Son, Jesus Christ, took a body and soul, and died on the cross for our sins."         |
| 3. "God the Son; Jesus Christ, took a body and soul, and died on the cross for our sins."         | 3. "I believe that you will make the good happy for ever in Heaven; He will burn the wicked 'for ever in Hell.'" |
| 4. God "will make" the good happy for ever in Heaven; He will burn the wicked "for ever in Hell." | 4. "I believe all the Catholic Church teaches; and in this blessed faith, with your help, I will live and die."  |

There is a very palpable difference between these two rules of Faith. The four great truths of Faith set forth p. 3 we find in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Catholic summaries of Faith, the ancient creeds; but in p. 29, a new, an immense, an increasing tenet—found not in Holy Scripture, and, therefore, not embodied in the ancient creeds—has been sub-introduced as a part of "the four great truths necessary for the salvation of your soul," binding every one to believe "all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent." Yea, more, the new creed of Pius IV., A.D. 1564; and since 8th December, 1854, the novel doctrine of the Immaculate Conception! Now, how many Roman Catholics have ever heard, known, or believed all things contained in this new tenet. "I believe all the (Roman) Catholic Church teaches." "Faith cometh by hearing," and as the mass of Romanists never heard, therefore, according to St. Paul, they cannot believe these things. Happy for them; for they are not ancient truth, but modern error, though taught by Redemptorist Fathers, and sanctioned by an Apostolic Delegate. At all times, such innovations were eschewed by all who "were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles."

The examination of "conscience on the commandments" (p. 7) needs special notice. If conscience be blind, or dead, or misguided in regard of God's commandments, may not most fatal results ensue? Passing over the fearful mutilation of God's commandments (p. 5), we are astounded by the teaching "on oaths." A witness (p. 43) in a court of justice is commonly obliged to tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." But witnesses (p. 11) are taught how to escape the obligation of an oath, and yet appear to take it! When they "swear on the book . . . so help me God," if they "do not mean to take an oath, then these words are NOT OATHS!!" No jury, where Redemptorist teaching prevails, can know if witnesses are really sworn; no sovereign, whether her Roman Catholic subjects take the oath of allegiance; the foundations of society and civil government are undermined among men, and "an oath for confirmation" ceases to be "the end of all their controversy." The hard cross-swearing which disgraces Irish courts is now a solved problem. Witnesses "do not mean to take an oath;" they therefore are not perjured, THEY ONLY LIE!!

Servile Work.—1. It is a sin to work on Sundays and holidays; 2. It is a mortal sin to work for about two hours or two hours and a-half. It is not servile work to write, or teach, or draw, or sing, or play music, or travel. If a person does on a Sunday what is not servile work, it is not a sin to be said for it. (pp. 12, 13).

Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day." "In it

<sup>a</sup> Rom. 10 c. 17 v. <sup>b</sup> Acts 2 c. 41 v.  
<sup>c</sup> The moral doctrines of the examination are those of St. A. Liguori, Short. Cat., p. 1.  
<sup>d</sup> Heb. 6, 16. <sup>e</sup> Prov. c. 30, v. 8, 9. <sup>f</sup> Eph. c. 4, v. 2, 8.